UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

District of New Mexico

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

V.

Judgment in a Criminal Case (For **Revocation** of Probation or Supervised Release)

Adrian Luke Gonzales

Case Number: 2:09CR01632-001JB

USM Number: 47456-051

Defense Attorney: Richard Winterbottom, Appointed

THE DEFE	NDANT:				
	admitted guilt to violations of condition(s) MC of the term of supervision. was found in violation of condition(s) after denial of guilt.				
The defenda	ant is adjudicated guilty of these violations:				
Violation Number	Nature of Violation		Violation Ended		
MC The defendant committed anoth		leral, state, or local crime.	04/25/2013		
The defenda Reform Act		ugh 3 of this judgment. The sent	ence is imposed pursuant to the Sentencing		
☐ The de	fendant has not violated condition(s) and	is discharged as to such violation	n(s).		
name, reside	ence, or mailing address until all fines, resti	itution, costs, and special assessn	for this district within 30 days of any change of ments imposed by this judgment are fully paid. It of material changes in economic circumstances		
9024		August 15, 2013	August 15, 2013		
Last Four Digits of Defendant's Soc. Sec. No.		Date of Imposition	Date of Imposition of Judgment		
1981		/s/ James O. Brow	/s/ James O. Browning		
Defendant's Year of Birth		Signature of Judge	Signature of Judge		
Dixon, NM			Honorable James O. Browning United States District Judge		
City and State of Defendant's Residence		Name and Title of .	Judge		
		August 30, 2013			
		Date Signed			

Case 2:09-cr-01632-JB Document 45 Filed 08/30/13 Page 2 of 3

AO 245D (Rev. 12/10) Judgment in a Criminal Case for Revocations Sheet 2 Imprisonment

Judgment Page 2 of 3

Defendant: Adrian Luke Gonzales Case Number: 2:09CR01632-001JB

IMPRISONMENT

The defendant is hereby committed to the custody of the United States Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a total term of 22 months.

A term of supervised release is not reimposed.

Although advisory, the Court has considered the Guidelines and, in arriving at its sentence, has taken account of the Guidelines with other sentencing goals. Specifically, the Court has considered the Guidelines` sentencing range established for the applicable category of offense committed by the applicable category of Defendant. The Court believes that the Guidelines` punishment is appropriate for this sort of offense. Therefore, the sentence in this judgment is consistent with a guideline sentence. The Court has considered the kind of sentence and range established by the Guidelines. The Court believes that a sentence of 22 months reflects the seriousness of the offense, promotes respect for the law, provides just punishment, affords adequate deterrence, protects the public, avoids unwarranted sentencing disparities among similarly situated defendants, effectively provides the Defendant with needed education or vocational training and medical care, and otherwise fully reflects each of the factors embodied in 18 U.S.C. Section 3553(a). The Court also believes the sentence is reasonable. The Court believes the sentence is sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to comply with the purposes set forth in the Sentencing Reform Act.

	The court makes these recommendations to the Bureau of Prisons:			
	The defendant is remanded to the custody of the United States Marshal. The defendant shall surrender to the United States Marshal for this district: at on as notified by the United States Marshal. The defendant shall surrender for service of sentence at the institution designated by the Bureau of Prisons: before 2 p.m. on as notified by the United States Marshal as notified by the Probation or Pretrial Services Office.			
RETURN				
I have executed this judgment as follows:				
Defendant delivered ontoto with a certified copy of this judgment.				
	UNITED STATES MARSHAL			

Case 2:09-cr-01632-JB Document 45 Filed 08/30/13 Page 3 of 3

By

DEPUTY UNITED STATES MARSHAL